REMARKS

The Official Action dated October 24, 2001 has been carefully considered.

Accordingly, the changes presented herewith, taken with the following remarks, are believed

sufficient to place the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is

respectfully requested.

By present amendment, claim 17 was amended to more clearly define the invention.

Support for this amendment may be found, for example, at page 10, lines 1-4, of the

specification. Attached hereto is a **"Versions With Markings to Show Changes Made"**

showing the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. Since this change is

believed to be fully supported by the specification and claims as originally filed and no new

matter is intended or believed to be involved, entry is believed to be in order and is

respectfully requested.

I.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Official Action, claims 1, 3-5 and 7-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as

being anticipated by Itoh (U.S. Patent No. 6,034,785). The Examiner asserts that Itoh teaches

a method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter as defined by independent

claim 1, a photoprinter capable of processing a digital photographic image two resolutions as

defined by independent claim 10, and a method of providing data management on a photoprinter

as defined by independent claim 17.

However, as will be set forth in detail below, it is submitted that the method of processing

a digital photographic image on a photoprinter as defined by claims 1, 3-5, and 7-9, the

photoprinter configurations of claims 10-16 and the method of providing data management on

a photoprinter of claims 17-20 are not anticipated by Itoh. Accordingly, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As defined by claim 1, the present invention is directed towards a method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter. The method comprises receiving a digital photographic image in a first format on a printer; performing one or more first operations on the digital photographic image in the first format; converting the digital photographic image to a second format; and performing one or more second operations on the digital photographic image in the second format.

As defined by claim 10, the present invention is directed towards a photoprinter capable of processing a digital photographic image at two resolutions. The photoprinter comprises a first memory in a first format; a second memory in a second format; and a controller wherein the controller performs one or more first operations on a digital photographic image in the first memory and one or more second operations on the digital photographic image in the second memory.

As defined by claim 17, the present invention is directed towards a method of providing data management on a photoprinter. The method comprises receiving a digital photographic image in a first format on a printer; storing the digital photographic image in a first memory in the first format; performing one or more first operations on the digital photographic image in the first memory; converting the digital photographic image to a second format; transferring and storing the digital photographic image in the second format to a second memory; and performing one or more second operations on the digital photographic image in the second memory.

Itoh discloses a digital print system, wherein the digital print system comprises an image input device, a controller, a printer, a display, a memory device, an input device, and a bonding

machine for bonding a print in which characters and an image output from the printer are synthesized onto a base sheet CRD such as a New Year's card or a standard postal card.

In the Official Action, the Examiner has asserted that the digital print system 10 shown in FIG. 1 of Itoh is a photoprinter. However, Applicants find no teaching, suggestion or disclosure in Itoh relating to a method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter as defined by claims 1, 3-5, and 7-9, the photoprinter configurations as defined by claims 10-16 and the method of providing data management on a photoprinter as defined by claims 17-20. Although Itoh discloses a digital print system which comprises multiple components, of which one component is a printer, one skilled in the art will recognize that this configuration is not a photoprinter as required by claims 1, 3-5 and 7-20. As defined by the present invention, a photoprinter is a stand-alone appliance for printing digital photographs onto a printable medium (see p. 5, lines 22 and 23 of the present specification). Moreover, the term "stand-alone" is defined as a printer capable of processing and printing digital files independent of an external host device, wherein processing means calculating a pixel pattern to be printed on the printable medium that represents the corresponding digital file. (see p. 5, lines 26 and 27 and p. 6, lines 1 and 2 of the present specification). The printer of Itoh fails to teach or suggest a stand-alone appliance for printing digital photographs onto a printable medium and Itoh fails to teach or suggest a printer, which is capable of processing and printing digital files independent of an external host device, such as a computer.

In addition, Itoh fails to teach or suggest the step of receiving a digital photographic image in a first format on a printer prior to converting the image to a second format as required by present claims 1 and 17. The Examiner has asserted that the image scanned in by scanner 12 is received in a first format on a printer 16. While Itoh discloses an image scanned in by scanner 12, the scanned image is not received on the printer prior to the step of converting the image to

a second format, but rather is received by controller 14 which is in communication with, but not on, printer 16 (see FIG. 1 of Itoh).

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claims under consideration, *Alco Standard Corp. v. TVA*, 808 F.2d 1490, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1337 (1341) (Fed. Cir. 1986). As Applicants find no teaching by Itoh relating to a photoprinter comprising a stand-alone appliance capable of processing and printing digital files independent of an external host device as required by independent claims 1, 10 and 17, Itoh does not anticipate claims 1, 3-5, and 7-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102. Moreover, Applicants find no teaching or suggestion by Itoh of a method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter or a method of providing data management on a photoprinter, which includes the step of receiving a digital photographic image in a first format on a printer, as required by independent claims 1 and 17, respectively.

It is therefore submitted that the presently claimed methods and photoprinter configurations are not anticipated by Itoh, whereby the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has been overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II.   **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

In the Official Action, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chang et al (U.S. Patent No.4,965,748). The Examiner noted that Itoh does not teach use of a print band buffer to store the image data at the second format. The Examiner relied on Chang et al as teaching the use of a print band buffer to store image data. The Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Itoh to include using a print band buffer to store the image data at the second format. The Examiner asserted that using a print

band buffer in the invention of Itoh would have reduced the memory size of the printer, the cost of the printer and the size of the circuitry for the printer.

However, as will be set forth in detail below, it is submitted that the method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter of claim 2 is non-obvious and patently distinguishable from the teachings of Itoh in further view of Chang et al. Accordingly, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As defined by claim 2, the present invention is directed towards the method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter of claim 1, further comprising storing the digital photographic image while in the first format in an image-storage buffer and storing the digital photographic image while at the second format in a print-band buffer.

As noted above, Itoh discloses a digital print system that lacks several features and elements of the claimed invention. Particularly, Itoh fails to teach or suggest a method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter comprising, inter alia, a stand-alone appliance capable of processing and printing digital files independent of an external host device or the step of receiving a digital photographic image in a first format on a printer as required by independent claim 1. As noted above, the printer of Itoh does not receive a digital photographic image in a first format prior to converting the image to a second format. Furthermore, the deficiencies of Itoh as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, are not resolved by Chang et al. That is, despite Chang et al's teaching of using a band buffer, Applicants find no teaching or suggestion by Chang et al of a method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter comprising, inter alia, a stand-alone photoprinter capable of processing and printing digital files independent of an external host device and the step of receiving a digital photographic image in a first format on a printer prior to converting the image to a second format.

To establish prima facie obviousness of the claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka,* 490 F. 2d 981; 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). In view of the failure of Itoh and Chang et al, alone or in combination, to teach, disclose or suggest a method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter comprising, inter alia, a stand-alone photoprinter and the step of receiving a digital photographic image in a first format on a printer prior to converting the image to a second format, the combination of Itoh and Chang et al does not support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

It is therefore submitted that the presently claimed method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter is non-obvious over and patentably distinguishable from Itoh in view of Chang et al, whereby the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, claim 6 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Levine (U.S. Patent No. 4,751,583). The Examiner noted that Itoh does not teach that the resolution format is in a camera resolution format. The Examiner relied on Levine as teaching inputting an image from a camera, with a camera resolution format, to be processed by a processor for printing. The Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Itoh to replace the scanner with a camera. The Examiner asserted that using a camera in the invention of Itoh would have provided the user with a better quality image with a higher resolution and in turn would have created a better picture or print out or print product for the users.

However, as will be set forth in detail below, it is submitted that the method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter of claim 6 is non-obvious and patently

distinguishable from the teachings of Itoh in further view of Levine. Accordingly, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As defined by claim 6, the present invention is directed towards the method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter of claim 1, wherein the first format is a camera resolution format.

As noted above, Itoh discloses a digital print system that lacks several features and elements of the claimed invention. Particularly, Itoh fails to teach or suggest a method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter comprising, inter alia, a stand-alone appliance capable of processing and printing digital files independent of an external host device or the step of receiving a digital photographic image in a first format on a printer as required by independent claim 1. As noted above, the printer of Itoh does not receive a digital photographic image in a first format prior to converting the image to a second format. Furthermore, the deficiencies of Itoh as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, are not resolved by Levine. That is, despite Levine's teaching of inputting an image from a camera to be processed by a processor for printing, Applicants find no teaching or suggestion by Levine of a method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter comprising, inter alia, a stand-alone photoprinter capable of processing and printing digital files independent of an external host device and the step of receiving a digital photographic image in a first format on a printer prior to converting the image to a second format. To the contrary, Levine teaches that the graphical processing functions "are performed by reading out selected ones of the still images that are electronically recorded in the internal memory of camera 10, and/or supplemental memory 24 and entering the selected images into the memory of the processor-previewer 12 for both display and processing. After processing, the processed image . . . can be later read-out to a copier-printer 22 ...." (See column 3, lines 40-54).

To establish prima facie obviousness of the claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka,* supra. In view of the failure of Itoh and Levine, alone or in combination, to teach, disclose or suggest a method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter comprising, inter alia, a stand-alone photoprinter and the step of receiving a digital photographic image in a first format on a printer prior to converting the image to a second format, the combination of Itoh and Levine does not support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

It is therefore submitted that the presently claimed method of processing a digital photographic image on a photoprinter is non-obvious over and patentably distinguishable from Itoh in view of Levine, whereby the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested..

It is believed that the above represents a complete response to the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 and places the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and an early allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

John P. Colbert
Registration No. 45,765
Attorney for Applicants
GRAYDON HEAD & RITCHEY LLP
1900 Fifth Third Center
511 Walnut Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 629-2747

280302.01

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

In the claims:

17.   (Amended) A method of providing data management on a photoprinter comprising:

receiving a digital photographic image in a first format on a printer;

storing the digital photographic image in a first memory in the first format;

performing one or more first operations on the digital photographic image in the first memory;

converting the digital photographic image to a second format; transferring and storing the digital photographic image in the second format to a second memory; and

performing one or more second operations on the digital photographic image in the second memory.